REMARKS

Claims 1-54 and 56-79 were considered by the Examiner. Claims 1-54 and 56-79 stand rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1-54 and 56-79 are pending, and are believed to be allowable over the references cited by the Examiner as discussed below.

Furthermore, Applicant reminds the Examiner again that Examiner has not provided a basis for his rejection of claim 47.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC Sec. 103

Claims 1-32, 51-54, and 56-69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski (USPN 4,654,655) and further in view of Lynn et al (USPN 5226077).

Independent claims 33, 70, and 75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski in further view of Endick et. al. (USPN 5,339,360)

Claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A telecommunication system comprising:

a telephone headset;

a headset adapter configured to be coupled to the telephone headset and having an accessory interface bus for transmitting and receiving communications packets, the headset adapter being configured to be coupled to a base telephone; and

an accessory for the telephone headset configured to be coupled to the accessory interface bus of the headset adapter, wherein the *accessory is independently and directly controlled and*

monitored by the headset adapter when the headset accessory is in communication with the headset adapter via the transmission of communications packets between the accessory and the headset adapter over the accessory interface bus*, the accessory monitored by transmitting a status monitoring message from the headset adapter over the accessory interface bus to the accessory.*

Claim 1 teaches a telecommunication system including a telephone headset, a headset adapter having an accessory interface bus for transmitting and receiving communications packets, and an accessory for the telephone headset configured to be coupled to the accessory interface bus of the headset adapter. The accessory is independently and directly controlled and monitored by the headset adapter when the headset accessory is in communication with the headset adapter via the transmission of communications packets between the accessory and the headset adapter over the accessory interface bus. In particular, claim 1 teaches that the *accessory is monitored by transmitting a status monitoring message from the headset adapter over the accessory interface bus to the accessory.*

Examiner acknowledges that neither Kowalski nor Applicants admitted art disclose monitoring the accessory by transmitting a status monitoring message from the headset adapter over an accessory interface bus to the accessory.

Examiner reads the Lynn amplifier (100) shown in Figure 3 onto the headset adapter of claim 1. In Lynn, the detector (110) of the amplifier (100) provides a detector output (120) which provides a signal having one state when the headset is connected to the amplifier, and a second state when the headset is not connected to the amplifier. However, Lynn does not teach monitoring a headset accessory as taught by claim 1. Rather, Lynn teaches monitoring a status of the headset itself. See Lynn at Col. 6, lines 52-54. Furthermore, Lynn does not teach

transmitting a status monitoring message from the headset adapter to the accessory, as taught by claim 1. Rather, Lynn teaches that the detector output (120) is provided to an activator (115) which is also part of the amplifier (100). See Lynn Fig. 3 and Col. 6, lines 56-58. Furthermore, Lynn does not teach transmitting a status monitoring message over an accessory interface bus, as taught by claim 1. Rather, Lynn teaches providing the detector output (120) directly to the input of activator (115). See Lynn Fig. 3 and Col. 6, lines 56-58.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Lynn does not teach or suggest monitoring a headset accessory by transmitting a status monitoring message from a headset adapter over an accessory interface bus to the accessory.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski and further in view of Lynn. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Independent Claims 15, 26, 33, 51, 56, 63, 66, 70, and 75

Because the limitations of independent claims 15, 26, 33, 51, 56, 63, 66, 70, and 75 are similar to those of claim 1, the same or similar arguments apply to claim 1 and are not repeated for purposes of conciseness and clarity only.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 15, 26, 33, 51, 56, 63, 66, 70, and 75 are patentable over Kowalski in view of Applicant's admitted art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15, 26, 33, 51, 56, 63, 66, 70, and 75.

Claims 40, 43, 45, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski and further in view of Markowitz (USPN, 6, 484,212).

Claim 40 reads as follows:

40. (Previously Presented) A computer readable medium containing executable program instructions for controlling and monitoring an accessory to a telecommunications headset using a headset adapter base and an interface bus, the executable program instructions including instructions for:

detecting whether an accessory is coupled to the interface bus;

receiving a communication packet at the headset adapter base over the interface bus from the accessory and identifying from a rate bit in the communication packet a communication packet transmission rate; and

transmitting a command or status request signal from the headset adapter base over the interface bus and to the accessory detected as being coupled to the interface bus to enable the headset adapter base to independently and directly control and monitor the operation of the accessory, the headset adapter base being configured to be connected to a base telephone, the *accessory monitored by transmitting a status monitoring message from the headset adapter base over the interface bus to the accessory.*

Claim 40 teaches a computer readable medium containing executable program instructions for controlling and monitoring an accessory to a telecommunications headset using a headset adapter base and an interface bus. The instructions include detecting whether an accessory is coupled to the interface bus, and receiving a communication packet from the accessory and identifying from a rate bit in the communication packet a communication packet transmission rate. The instructions further include monitoring the operation of the accessory by

transmitting a status monitoring message from the headset adapter base over the interface bus to the accessory.

Because certain limitations of claim 40 are similar to those of claim 1, the same or similar arguments apply to claim if 1 and are not repeated for purposes of conciseness and clarity only.

Furthermore, neither Kowalski in view of Markowitz nor Applicant's admitted prior art, either alone or in combination, teach receiving a communication packet at a headset adapter base over an interface bus from the accessory and *identifying from a rate bit in the communication packet a communication packet transmission rate.*

In the current office action, Examiner acknowledges that the admitted prior art and Kowalski do not teach receiving a communication packet at the headset adapter base over the interface bus from the accessory and identifying from a rate bit in the communication packet a communication packet transmission rate.

Examiner asserts that Markowitz at Fig. 8-9 and Col. 6, lines 38-60 discloses user devices which send bandwidth information to a controller. However, Markowitz merely teaches that a user device *sends a request for media information.* Markowitz does not teach that the user device sends a communication packet having a rate bit identifying a communication packet transmission rate. Markowitz is silent with respect to a how the gateway proxy device (115) determines the bandwidth of the user device connection. Markowitz states only that the gateway proxy device searches a memory for a version of the media information encoded for the user device connection bandwidth.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 40 is patentable over Applicant's admitted art in view of Kowalski further in view of Markowitz. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 40.

Claims 2-14, 16-25, 27-32, 43, 45, 47, 49, 52-54, 57-62, 64-65, and 67-69.

Claims 2-14, 16-25, 27-32, 43, 45, 47, 49, 52-54, 57-62, 64-65, and 67-69, which depend variously from independent claims 1, 15, 26, 33, 40, 51, 56, 63, 66, and 70, are believed to be allowable for at least similar reasons as those discussed above.

Furthermore, Applicant reminds the Examiner again that Examiner has not provided a basis for his rejection of claim 47. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 47 is in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-14, 16-25, 27-32, 43, 45, 47, 49, 52-54, 57-62, 64-65, and 67-69 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 34-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 71-74, and 76-79.

Claims 34-39, 71-74, and 76-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski in further view of Endick et. al. (USPN 5,339,360).

Claims 41 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski and Markowitz in further view of Yamaguchi (USPN 5,278,848), in further view of King (USPN 3,793,488).

Claims 42, 44, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski in further view of Yamaguchi (USPN 5,278,848), in further view of King (USPN 3,793,488), and further in view of Waechter et al (USPN 4,943,963).

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski in further view of Yamaguchi (USPN 5,278,848), in further view of King (USPN 3,793,488), and further in view of Jones et al (USPN 5,140,611).

However, the addition of any of the additional secondary references does not make up for the deficiencies of Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski as discussed above. Thus, claims 34-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 71-74, and 76-79, dependent variously from independent claims 33, 40, 70, and 75 are also believed to be allowable for at least similar reasons as those discussed above. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 34-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 71-74, and 76-79 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 15, 2009 By: /Thomas C. Chuang/

Thomas C. Chuang
IP Law Office of Thomas Chuang
USPTO Reg. No. 44,616
180 Sansome St.
11th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Phone: 415.274.2598
Fax: 415.274.2598